

Interview Summary

Application No.
10/032,941

Applicant(s)
Harry et al

Examiner
Sheila V. Clark

Art Unit
2815



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sheila V. Clark

(3) Paul Pysher

(2) Tony Moosey

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 21 and May 23, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner relayed to Mr. Moosey and Mr. Pysher that the claims are currently written in very broad terms and that the compliant interconnect recited in the claims fails to provide any specific features that establish said interconnect in relationship with any specific type of inerconnect. It is currently applicable to both electrical and mechanical devices. Further the chamber recited may be structured in many different ways from a groove to a hole. It was explined that the structure recited in the claims was not recited to show the specific structure in the instant drawings but could read on various types of stgtructures. (see attached page)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

SHEILA V. CLARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2815

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is
an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 2815

Interview summary contin.

Mr. Moosey relayed that the compliant layer had a stress reliever advantage. Said advantage however failed to be recited in the claims and defined appropriately. Also relayed was that relating said compliant layer to an electrical interconnect and recite language such as of air gaps, elastic in plane behavior during temp. changes and other language such as discussed on pg. 4 of the disclosure would give more substance to said claims for allowance consideration.